

## II. REMARKS

### A. *Status of the Claims*

Claims 1-17 and 20 were pending. Claims 1, 5 9-17, and 20 have been canceled. Claims 18-19 have been withdrawn. Claims 2, 4, and 6-8 have been amended. Claims 21-26 have been added. Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 21-26 are now pending. No new matter has been added.

Amendments have been presented in the Office's newly-approved "revised format."

### B. *Restriction*

Applicants confirm the previous oral election of claims 1-17 and 20. The election was made without traverse. Claims 18 and 19 are withdrawn.

### C. *Drawings*

In view of the amendments and explanations presented in this response, it is believed that all objections to the drawings are rendered moot. The claim language has been simplified, and the drawings show the claimed features and comply with all applicable rules. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

### D. *Specification*

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's request for the correction of errors to the specification.

### E. *Section 112 Rejections*

Claims 9-15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for lacking written description. Applicants assert that those claims complied with Section 112. Nevertheless, they have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims comply fully with Section 112.

*F. Section 102 Rejections*

Claims 1-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Schlosser. Most of the rejected claims have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot. The public is put on notice that the cancellation of those claims does not constitute a waiver or an admission that their subject matter was anticipated or rendered obvious. Rather, Applicants believe that the claims were patentable. Applicants simply desired to simplify the wording of several of the claims, and replacement of original claims with re-worded claims was the most efficient manner to accomplish that task.

As explained below, the cited art does not disclose or even suggest the features contained in the pending claims.

*1. New independent claim 21 is in condition for allowance*

Claim 21 is supported at least by pages 13-15 of the specification and by FIGS. 2A and 2B. In fact, the representative embodiments of FIGS. 2A and 2B may be used for giving context to claim 21 (although those figures do not serve as limitations). Claim 21 recites, in part:

(d) a first plurality of springs movably coupling the first comb pair and the stage, the first plurality of springs being spaced along a first side of the stage between edges of the stage; and

(e) a second plurality of springs movably coupling the second comb pair and the stage, the second plurality of springs being spaced along a second side of the stage between edges of the stage.

(emphasis added).

With reference to FIG. 2A, it can be seen that springs 205B, 205C, 205D, and 205E are spaced along a first side of stage 220 between the edges of the stage. Similarly, springs 210F and 210G are spaced along a second side of stage 220 between edges of the stage. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

In contrast, Schlosser appears to contemplate edge connections. *See* Figure 4, p. 6. Nowhere is there disclosed or suggested the type of coupling and spacing currently claimed. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 21 and all of its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

2. *New independent claim 22 is in condition for allowance*

Claim 22 is supported at least by page 16 of the specification and by FIG. 4A. In fact, the representative embodiment of FIG. 4A may be used for giving context to claim 22 (although that figure does not serve as a limitation). Claim 22 recites, in part:

- (a) a pair of opposite exterior combs; and
- (b) a corresponding pair of opposite interior combs;
- (c) wherein the opposite interior combs are coupled together with an inter-link.

With reference to FIG. 4A, an exemplary pair of opposite exterior combs 430B and 430D can be seen with opposite interior combs 435B and 435D. The opposite interior combs 435B and 435D are coupled together with inter-link 440. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

In contrast, Schlosser discloses or suggests no inter-link as currently claimed. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

3. *New independent claim 23 is in condition for allowance*

Claim 23 is supported at least by pages 16-17 of the specification and by FIG. 4B. In fact, the representative embodiment of FIG. 4B may be used for giving context to claim 23 (although that figure does not serve as a limitation). Claim 23 recites, in part:

- (a) external comb pairs having a frame; and
- (b) internal nested comb pairs that are rigidly nested within the frame.

With reference to FIG. 4B, exemplary external comb pairs 470A and 470B having a frame can be seen. Internal nested comb pairs 470C and 470D are rigidly nested within that frame. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

In contrast, Schlosser discloses or suggests no nested comb pairs as currently claimed. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

*4. New claims 24 and 25 are in condition for allowance*

Claims 24 and 25 are supported at least by pages 17-19 of the specification and by FIGS. 5-7B. In fact, the representative embodiment of FIG. 5 may be used for giving context to claim 24, and the representative embodiment of FIG. 7A may be used for giving context to claim 25 (although those figures do not serve as limitations). Claim 24 recites, in part:

- (c) movable combs in opposing relation with the fixed combs;  
and
- (d) springs coupled:
  - (i) to movable combs coupled between ends of the movable combs, and
  - (ii) to the micro-frame.

With reference to FIG. 5, exemplary movable combs 515B and 515D in opposed relation with fixed combs 510B and 510D can be seen. Springs 520B and 520D are coupled between ends of the movable combs (in the figure, near the center of each combs) to micro-frame 503.

Claim 25 recites an array of micro-frames. With reference to FIG. 7A, a representative array can be seen.

In contrast, Schlosser discloses or suggests none of these features. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 24 and 25 are in condition for allowance.

*5. New independent claim 26 is in condition for allowance*

Claim 26 is supported at least by pages 13-19 of the specification and by FIGS. 2A-7B. The representative embodiments of any of those figures may be used for giving context to

claim 26 (although those figures do not serve as limitations). Claim 26 recites, in part, a spring coupled (i) to a movable comb between ends of the comb and (ii) to a stage. Claim 26 also recites, in part, a spring coupling an end of one movable comb to an end of another movable comb.

In contrast, Schlosser appears to contemplate edge connections. *See* Figure 4, p. 6. Nowhere is there disclosed or suggested the type of coupling currently claimed. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 26 is in condition for allowance.